

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 5-11 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended and claims 2-4 and 12-30 have been canceled by this amendment. No claims have been allowed.

Claims 1, 5, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson (3,517,584) in view of Caddie (NPS/CIRPAS Activity Summary).

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Marks (5,461,960).

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Robinson and further in view of Schillreff (3,808,940).

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson and further in view of Mayersak (5,866,833).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Robinson teaches a stores ejection system for ejecting explosive missiles from an aircraft. However, Robinson is silent as to any imaging capability from onboard the aircraft.

The Caddie description teaches an unmanned aircraft equipped with chemical warfare intelligence sensor payloads that are dispensed from the aircraft. Similar to Robinson,

the Caddie description is silent as to any imaging capability from onboard the aircraft.

In contrast, Applicant teaches and now claims (in claim 1) a payload dispensing system for an unmanned aerial vehicle that includes, among other things,

a first video camera mounted on the front of the unmanned aerial vehicle and coupled to the system's transmitter for generating a first video image of what is in front of the unmanned aerial vehicle;

a second video camera, mounted on the unmanned aerial vehicle so as to view downward therefrom, for generating a second video image of what is beneath the unmanned aerial vehicle; and

a video switcher interposed between the first and second video cameras and the system's transmitter where the video switcher is connected to receive and respond to output signals from the system's receiver in order to supply to the system's transmitter with one of (i) the first video image, (ii) the second video image, and (iii) the first and second video images, for transmission to the ground control station.

Since amended claim 1 essentially incorporates the structural limitations of canceled claims 2-4, it is respectfully submitted that this amendment does not necessitate an additional prior art search. Further, these

limitations are supported by the disclosure at page 8, lines 9-20 of Applicant's originally-filed specification.

Neither Robinson or the Caddie description teach or suggest Applicant's video imaging capability that allows an on-the-ground operator to choose one of a forward-looking video image, a downward-looking video image, or a combination (i.e., picture-in-picture) of forward and downward-looking video images. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 5, 10 and 11 are patentable over Robinson et al. in view of Caddie.

Burchfiel, which was used to reject canceled claims 2-4, teaches a vehicle navigation system that uses either forward or side-looking cameras. See column 1, lines 38-50.

The system could use images taken from either camera configuration. However, nothing in Burchfiel teaches or suggests the use of both forward and downward-looking video cameras or the inclusion of a remotely-controllable video switcher that allows an on-the-ground operator to choose one of a forward-looking video image, a downward-looking video image, or a combination (i.e., picture-in-picture) of forward and downward-looking video images as Applicant teaches and claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 (as essentially incorporating the limitations of canceled claims 2-4) is patentable over Robinson et al. in view of

Burchfiel.

Marks merely discloses a dispenser for connection to a sequencer breech plate of an aircraft dispensing system. However, Marks does not teach or suggest any video imaging, and does not teach or suggest Applicant's video imaging capability that allows an on-the-ground operator to choose one of a forward-looking video image, a downward-looking video image, or a combination (i.e., picture-in-picture) of forward and downward-looking video images. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is patentable over Robinson in view of Marks.

Schillereff merely discloses a portable decoy launcher system. However, Schillereff does not teach or suggest any video imaging, and does not teach or suggest Applicant's video imaging capability that allows an on-the-ground operator to choose one of a forward-looking video image, a downward-looking video image, or a combination (i.e., picture-in-picture) of forward and downward-looking video images. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 8 are patentable over Robinson in view of Schillereff.

Mayersak merely discloses a guidance system for aircraft launched bombs. However, Mayersak does not teach or suggest any video imaging, and does not teach or suggest

Applicant's video imaging capability that allows an on-the-ground operator to choose one of a forward-looking video image, a downward-looking video image, or a combination (i.e., picture-in-picture) of forward and downward-looking video images. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is patentable over Robinson in view of Mayersak.

None of the prior art cited by the Examiner teaches or suggests the unique combination taught by Applicant. In view of the art of record, the claims remaining in the case are considered to patentably distinguish thereover.

It is submitted in view of these remarks that all grounds for rejection have been removed by the foregoing amendment. For the hereinabove reasons, Applicant solicits an early and favorable response. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 50-0967.

Respectfully submitted,



SCOTT R. BOALICK  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 42,337

Naval Surface Warfare Center  
Dahlgren Division  
Office of Counsel, Code XDC1  
17320 Dahlgren Road  
Dahlgren, VA 22448-5000  
(540) 653-8061